

**East Carolina University
FACULTY SENATE
FULL MINUTES OF APRIL 17, 2012**

The eighth regular meeting of the 2011-2012 Faculty Senate was held on Tuesday, April 17, 2012, in the Mendenhall Student Center Great Room.

I. Call to Order

Marianna Walker, Chair of the Faculty called the meeting to order at 2:10 p.m.

II. Approval of Minutes

The minutes of March 20, 2012 and March 27, 2012 were approved as distributed.

III. Special Order of the Day

A. Roll Call

Senators absent were: Professors Zoller (Art and Design), Stiller (Biology), Carolan (Mathematics), Fitzgerald, and Terrian (Medicine), Julian (Nursing), Shinpaugh (Physics), Edwards (Sociology), Darkenwald (Theatre and Dance).

Alternates present were: Professors Pastor for Cope (English), Meggs for Chen (Interior Design and Merchandising), Ruiz-Eschevarria for Malek (Medicine), Treadwell for Novick (Medicine), and Frank for Smith (Technology and Computer Science).

B. Announcements

The Chancellor has approved the following resolution from the January 2012 Faculty Senate meeting:

#12-03 Formal faculty advice on proposed revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*,
Appendix F. Graduate School Organization.

The title of the annual Max Ray Joyner Award for Faculty Service through Continuing Education has been changed to the Max Ray Joyner Award for Excellence in Teaching through Distance Education.

Faculty interested in periodically receiving issues of *The Chronicle of Higher Education* are asked to call the Faculty Senate office at 328-6537 and place their name on a list for distribution.

A preliminary call for nominations for the *Board of Governors Award for Excellence in Teaching*, *Board of Governors Distinguished Professor for Teaching Award*, *East Carolina Alumni Association Outstanding Teaching Award* and *Robert L. Jones Teaching Award* will be distributed soon to all academic unit heads. Nomination materials will be due September 1 and portfolios due November 1. Information on the different award nominating procedures are available at <http://www.ecu.edu/cs-acad/fsonline/aa/academicawards.cfm>.

Thanks were extended to Chancellor Ballard for the refreshments provided at each Faculty Senate meeting.

C. Steve Ballard, Chancellor

Chancellor Ballard thanked Dr. Walker for her hard work and leadership for the past three years. He then summarized a few things from the Board of Governors meeting last month. One of the big discussions, at the Board of Governor's meeting, was the recent trip that some Board members made to China. The global understandings project directed by Rosina Chia was very well recognized and complimented by the Board members, even though Phil Dixon was the only ECU representative who

went on that trip. One of the classes taught from ECU to students in China was showcased while the members of the Board were in attendance.

The three or four biggest topics of discussion at the Board meeting had to do with academic consolidation, mandatory health care costs, performance-based funding, and faculty workload advisory groups. The Chancellor stated that he was one of three presenters on the PPP (Program Prioritization Process) at the Board of Governors meeting. He stated that ECU got a lot of credit for the systematic and open way that the university had been dealing with the implications of budget reductions in the classroom. He congratulated everyone who participated in the development of that process. N.C. State also talked about their process, and there was a presentation of a language consortium that was directed by Appalachian State and UNC-Greensboro. The Chancellor stated that this called attention to some interesting collaborations going on in foreign languages and literatures. There were also discussions over academic consolidation and program prioritization at N.C. Central and UNC-Greensboro, so reorganization is a topic, according to the Chancellor, that every campus, the UNC Board of Governors and the ECU Board of Trustees remains interested in. Chancellor Ballard asked everyone to keep providing feedback, and to get their ideas to Ron Michelson so that the PPC can do everything possible to weigh what they are told and formulate the best solutions for consideration.

Mandatory health insurance costs were also discussed at the Board of Governor's meeting and President Ross since sent a request to vote on one of three options to the campuses. The Chancellor said that he felt that none of the options were good news and all have a substantial increase to at least part of the student body. It will be necessary for the administration to determine what the least damaging option will be for the students and to the University. As of today, Chancellor Ballard stated, there was no "least damaging" option. If all campuses voted to have one rate it would be about \$1000 per student; today students pay \$885 per year for coverage, so that is a fairly small increase. It must be recognized that annual increases are almost a certainty. But if all campuses do not want to go together as a composite then every campus has to choose either between rates for graduates vs. undergraduates or for elements of age banding. Age banding would be devastating to graduate students because the older you are the more you pay, basically, up to almost \$4000 for students over age 44. So the undergraduates would be protected under age banding, but the older graduate students would have to pay substantially higher premiums. The argument for that, of course, is that they take advantage of the health insurance more than other age groups and get more benefits, and perhaps, they should pay for their higher claim levels. The fundamental institutional difficulty with this, is that health insurance should not determine our decisions on tuition, on fees, and on debt services and that is what the Chancellor stated that he thinks is about to happen. If these insurance increases are at this highest level it will virtually eliminate many of the things we are planning on doing. This would include restoring some of the cuts to the academic colleges; students could well be asked to pay more money in fees. The Chancellor concluded that these are really tough decisions and ECU is probably a couple weeks away from knowing how the Board of Governors and the GA plan on dealing with the topic of health care cost increases.

There was also a discussion of performance funding in the budget and finance committee, and there was a rigorous discussion of the performance funding model. The Chancellor stated that Professor Rigsby's comments in the last Faculty Senate meeting were exactly correct. The proposed criteria are not measurements of quality; they are measuring input and other elements. These are not unimportant, but the idea is that all campuses would have 10 variables, 7 of these would be consistent across all 16 campus. So everybody gets measured on graduation rates, retention rates,

and energy efficiency and, probably, degree efficiency. But then, all campuses would have 3 of their own indicators that they would suggest and presumably negotiate with the GA, depending on the variables. And then, every year each university must report how close it came to yearly improvements for each of its 10 goals. The yearly improvement for each goal would determine the score the university would get on that variable and then the score of university compared to other universities in the system would determine how much money each university would get from a fund that GA is requesting from the legislature. So everything depends on whether the legislature is willing to fund performance-based enrollment or performance-based education, and how competitive ECU would be in that "sweepstakes." The Chancellor reported that ECU is doing very well on retention rates and on energy efficiency and that there is certainly a kind of a gaming aspect to the three variables that the campuses decide will be unique to their university. However, these variables really do not say a lot about what professors do on a daily basis, and, the Chancellor said, that is the fundamental problem. The indicators do not really relate to whether your students are learning more or getting into graduate school or whether we are being successful in research grants or other dozens of things we do very well. So, the criticism is quite correct that it is a little bit removed from what most of the faculty do and therefore we administrators struggle with how to make the indicators relevant. It is an extraordinarily political process and ECU will be hurt far worse if we do not come up with some system for having multiple variables that somehow capture some of the things that this university does well in a unique way. The performance funding model is probably going to happen, and the Chancellor reported that it probably needs to happen. It is probably better for the GA and for the Board of Governors to determine what it looks like than for the legislature to mandate the criteria Chancellor Ballard stated his opinion that it will be better than the system the system used three years ago and it might well prevent some intrusive micro-management of the university system by others in the state who will go unnamed. He concluded that performance funding is a work in progress and it will take a lot more time to refine.

The University system Faculty Advisory Workload Group also met and there was some really interesting data presented; the Chancellor stated that he hoped the Faculty Senate had access to this comparative data and if not, then it will be sent out. The most interesting data was the time-comparison of faculty workloads from 2008 to 2011. The data presented was averaged for all faculty on campus, and included the number of average sections taught and the number of average student credit hours taught per faculty. In a nutshell, the sections per faculty went up 31% over this three-year period. At ECU the average student credit hours taught per faculty member increased 12%. So certainly our faculty are doing more with less, there is no other way to evaluate the data than that. In terms of student credit hours, ECU is right in the middle, at the mean, of the UNC system evaluation of all the campuses. Thus, it is not that our faculty are teaching more or less than the average in the system since there needs to be a recognition that there is a tremendous variation across the campuses from the mean. The GA was extremely supportive of the faculty workloads and the contributions to the system in the last Board of Governors meeting. As stated in the State of the University Address; it is a question of all of us telling the story as much as we possibly can, this awareness of what the University contributes is starting to have an impact.

Chancellor Ballard stated that the faculty are making a recommendation on the faculty athletic representative today and he welcomed thoughts and ideas on that. He stated David Dosser has done an A+ job and is highly respected in this system, so he urged everyone to give David a careful evaluation. Dr. Dosser has been very great for the credibility and integrity of how staff thinks about athletics and academics on this campus. He chairs the Academic Success Committee, which is extraordinarily innovative committee that addresses almost all aspects of the academic well being of

our student athletes and over time will do a lot to put the student first in the equation of student athlete. The Chancellor stated that he has earning the meager pay that we give him as the FAR (Faculty Athletics Representative).

The Chancellor concluded his remarks by stating that as most people know, we are thinking seriously, systematically, and comprehensively about an interim Vice Chancellor for Research. No one should expect an announcement on this appointment until two weeks from now, but the goal is to make an announcement before commencement and have an interim Vice Chancellor identified. He stated that the Faculty Senate would be made aware of the choice before the end of the semester.

Professor Rigsby (Geological Sciences) asked in reference to the three campus methods for performance funding, what process would ECU follow? Provost Sheerer replied that IPAR personnel and administrators will determine the variables we want to select in order to show growth. We can't show any growth and can't invest too much. The quality is recognized but we don't know how to address. She welcomed any suggestions on how to address quality

Chair Walker thanked the Chancellor for his comments and advocacy for the faculty.

D. Marilyn Sheerer, Provost and Senior Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs

Provost Sheerer stated that she had been asked to speak about three specific topics and would like to add a few comments since this will be the last regular Faculty Senate meeting of the year. The Provost began her remarks by discussing University 1000. She stated that the university is involved in the Foundations in Excellence Initiative which is an effort to improve the first year and transfer student experiences; having an orientation course like COAD 1000 is an essential part of that effort in the opinion of the Provost. COAD 1000 has been offered to many freshmen on our campus. It has been taught by Student Services and Student Affairs staff, but also by some faculty. Some units have also taught some of the COAD 1000 sessions, but unfortunately only about half of the freshmen are currently getting access to any COAD 1000 course. ECU administrators have been trying to think of how all freshmen on campus or at least most of them might take the class. A year ago Chair Marianna Walker and the Provost charged a committee with the task of designing a course entitled University 1000 that would include all freshmen and transfer students. The co-chairs of that committee are David Siegel and Mary Beth Corbin who will provide an update on the work of that group. Our continued goal there is to have faculty and Student Affairs and Student Services staff work together in a collaborative manner and to create courses and options to improve the first year experience.

The SACS QEP is off to an excellent start under the leadership of Wendy Sharer. The focus is on one of the core elements of learning: writing, and this initiative will give ECU an opportunity to show the connections between Arts and Sciences and the professional units on campus. This is a campus-wide initiative and when SACS comes for their onsite visit in 2013 it will be the entire focus of their review, so the QEP is very important.

Distance Education was the third topic discussed by the Provost. She asked had asked that the guidelines for addressing Distance Education which have just received from SACS be distributed to the faculty. The referenced a document is entitled Guidelines for Addressing Distance and Correspondence Education. These new guidelines address some of the questions that have been asked, one such as proctoring and training requirements. One of the SACS statements is: *"At the time of the review, by the commission, the institution must demonstrate that a student who registers*

in a distance or correspondence education course or program is the same student who participates in and completes the course or receives the credit. This must be done by verifying the identity of a student who participates in class or coursework or by using, at the option of the institution, methods such as a secure log-in and pass code, proctored examinations, or other technologies that are effective in student identification.” The question is: “Is the secure login and pass code enough?” The compliance report for ECU is due fall 2012 since the visit is scheduled for Spring 2013. Some academic units have already mandated that the proctoring centers be used. ECU is going to expand the proctoring center in Greenville. It is available to all enrolled students. Asst. VC for Emerging Academic Initiatives Elmer Poe and others believe that it is just a matter of time until the Department of Education and SACS will mandate that either virtual or physical proctoring to be done. Everyone is exploring the virtual piece right now.

Evaluation and Training is the next topic of concern related to SACS. From the new manual the institution has clear criteria for the evaluation of faculty teaching distance education courses and programs. Faculty who teach in distance education programs and courses must receive “appropriate training.” The Provost stated that she was pleased that Faculty Senate passed the DE training modules and that peer reviews are being conducted. Every faculty member who teaches online going forward, according to our current policy, must complete a development activity related on online teaching and learning. Thanks to the Online Quality Council and the new Faculty Senate Committee on DE, ECU is focusing on ongoing compliance.

The Provost stated that she wanted to make a few comments about the work of Faculty Senate in conjunction with all the university administration. Provost Sheerer felt that real progress has been made this year. She thanked Chair Marianna Walker for working so closely with the Academic Council. She felt they mutually had dealt with all kinds of things and that progress had really been made. Everything from the Faculty Manual to the University Policy Manual had gone well. The Faculty Senate has passed the replacement of the SOIS which is now called SPOTS – The Student Perception of Teaching Survey. She thanked that committee very much. They have done yeoman’s work all year in trying to revamp that document. The Provost felt it is an improvement and thanked Professor Mike Brown for chairing that group. She stated that she is aware that there is a need to continue to work on the plus/minus grading policy. The Provost stated that she intends to send out a final interpretation on applying the plus/minus grading system.

Academic program reviews were conducted by six departments since August 2011 and five more are scheduled for the coming fall. For the last three years we have done an excellent job under Linner Griffin’s leadership in conducting these program reviews, and have received some very interesting reports that are helpful to improving our programs.

Additionally, Provost Sheerer acknowledged the Foundations Curriculum and Instructional Effectiveness Committee. This committee has encouraged departments to assess Foundations courses and some upper-level courses have removed Foundations credit. The Provost thanked them very much and stated it is a long time in coming. She also stated her pleasure that the globalization and cultural diversity proposal reviewed by Faculty Senate has met with an open reception. In addition, new degree programs have been presented to GA. For example, there was a request for authorization to plan the Doctor of Nursing Practice, notification of intent to plan the M.S. in Biomedical Engineering, notification of intent to plan the B.S. in University Studies, and an M.A. in Hispanic Studies is awaiting the Chancellor’s signature. Also, there is a proposal to establish the request for authorization to establish the M.S. in Health Informatics and Information Management,

which was approved by the Board of Governors and requests for authorization to establish the M.S. in Network Technology. All these things represent all kinds of work that had been produced cooperatively and the Provost stated that felt good about getting those things moving forward.

Professor McKinnon (Interior Design and Merchandising) asked about a program that had been discussed by the Dean of the College of Human Ecology as being required this Fall. The program would use Skype, or a similar video feed, to verify that the person taking the exam was the actual student who was registered. Provost Sheerer stated that ECU administrators were looking at the possibility of virtual proctoring, but that nothing had been finalized at this time.

Professor Ross (Allied Health Sciences) stated that online mandatory attendance for final exams was needed in order to prove that it was the person that was taking the course. According to the newspaper 65% of the online students live in Greenville. That way the person taking the final exam could be identified. Provost Sheerer replied that this was certainly something that could be discussed and considered.

Professor Christian (Business) stated that he attended an information session recently where it was discussed that the UNC system currently has online proctoring that does not use Skype but a scanner that monitors and verifies the students. He noted that Elmer Poe and others were working on various options for consideration by ECU administration. Professor Christian and Provost Sheerer stated that General Administration had not yet agreed to cover the cost of online proctoring.

Professor Henze (English) stated that there were many distance education programs in which the students were not local, including military students, etc. who were doing their coursework while deployed.

Chair Walker thanked the Provost for her continued support of faculty.

E. Marianna Walker, Chair of the Faculty

Professor Walker (Allied Health Sciences) provided the following remarks to the Faculty Senate.

“Today is the last regular Faculty Senate meeting for the year and my last formal remarks to the Faculty Senate. I have thought about how I would end my three- year term as Faculty Chair, and what I would want to say to all of you and to the faculty as a whole. If I named each of the people with whom I have worked and have given me support, we would be here until Friday, and we really don’t have that long, so I will try to summarize what these past three years have meant to me and what WE have accomplished. First, it has been a pleasure to serve you, and to represent the faculty in these past three years.

Since 2009, I have written my Faculty Senate and Convocation remarks to address current issues facing the faculty and the university, many which were titled to reflect my thoughts at the time. A theme in many of my remarks has been the overarching practice of shared governance. In researching and editing the Introduction to the Faculty Manual (on the agenda today), with former Chair of the Faculty, Bob Morrison, I realized that shared governance is not just a “concept” at East Carolina University, but a history of successful collaboration between the faculty, Faculty Senate, and the administration since 1964. Our shared governance system has facilitated contemporary issues of the university, provided valuable input from faculty and Faculty Senate, and facilitated productive discourse and collaboration between administration and faculty. In these last three years, my

experiences and role in representing the faculty has resulted in looking at the university as a whole, to represent all the units in our “multi-discipline society” and to facilitate conversations about needed policy changes in a multiple areas. Without your help and support, I would not have been able to facilitate and coordinate the Faculty Senate’s role in matters pertaining to academic policies, faculty welfare, and university governance.

So, what have we accomplished in the past three years. First, the Faculty Manual – Wow! The last few sections are on the agenda today for consideration by the Senate. If approved by the Chancellor, the Faculty Manual will be complete in its review and revision, including updated references to UNC-GA policy, state statues, current administrative PRRs, and internal processes. Beginning in Fall 2012, the Faculty Manual will be reorganized and will contain all the newly approved language, policies and procedures traditionally within the purview of the faculty. I have provided each of you a draft of the Table of Contents, which will be the new face and organization of the Faculty Manual. As you can see, there are no more appendices, and the redundancies have been eliminated throughout the manual, since being charged in July 2009, by Chancellor Ballard, to complete the review and revision of the manual. I leave the office of Faculty Chair, with gratitude to the many individuals who have placed a priority in meeting deadlines, meeting with the university attorneys, administrators, staff, and faculty (including committees) from across campus in order to get the job done! With this work, we are known on campus as “getting our work accomplished” while continuing to address other contemporary issues, such as SACS, budget cuts, faculty workloads, PPC’s self and university studies, while undertaking our teaching loads and research and creative activities. The Faculty Senate and its committees are known for its productivity and our reputation has been recognized by other UNC institutions.

I cannot express enough thanks to the Faculty Officers – Vice Chair Mark Sprague, Secretary Hunt McKinnon, and Parliamentarian Brenda Killingsworth, who have been on our team for the past three years. We have worked together on behalf of the faculty, often with different lenses, but in a common interest of the university as a whole. I thank you for three wonderful years of dedicated work and collaboration with the Chancellor and the Academic Council, and in having fun! Also, ultimate gratitude goes to Lori Lee, who has been a partner with me for the past three years as Chair, and two years prior in my roles as Vice Chair and Secretary. Her wisdom and institutional knowledge, organization, and efficiency make the Faculty Senate office one of the busiest and most productive offices on campus. Lori, thank you for ALL you have done for me and for the faculty. And special gratitude goes to my husband, Professor Gregg Givens, for your never-ending support, care, and understanding throughout this long journey.

I would also like to publically thank Chancellor Ballard for his support of the faculty, Faculty Senate, and for preserving the Faculty Manual. I truly appreciate your willingness to listen and advocate for the entire faculty and the academic core. Thanks to the Provost Sheerer and Vice Chancellor Horns for believing in shared governance and for having faith in the system and university academic committees as the vehicle for curriculum and a voice in academic matters. I thank you as well for your support of the faculty and your skilled negotiation, patience, and leadership in a number of controversial matters, including FSIL policy and Appendix F – Graduate School Governance. Thanks to Vice Chancellor Mageean for your leadership in establishing ECU as an engaged university and input into the new definition of scholarship on our campus, which now includes scholarship of engagement, outreach, and innovation.

My gratitude also goes to members of the 26 University Standing Academic and Appellate Committees for their work on the Faculty Manual and/or other charges, including providing formal advice on administrative PRR's. The Faculty Manual review has required many extra meetings of the committees, many of whom have met weekly instead of monthly, these committees have truly undertaken the majority of effort and review of the manual and advice on administrative policies. My thanks are also bestowed to the Faculty Manual Steering Committee who has met monthly for three years, as an advisory group in the review and revision of the Faculty Manual.

We have revised committee charges, have collapsed some committees, added two new committees, and have changed a few committee names. Again, this work began as a function of the Faculty Manual revision, SACS, and contemporary issues. In addition to the language and procedures as updated and outlined in the Faculty Manual, the process for shared governance continues to function in a productive manner and has even been strengthened in the past three years.

As I leave as the Faculty Chair in July, I will remember the many contributions of our actions, dialogues, discourse, writings, and negotiations. I feel confident that through these actions, the process of successful shared governance will continue. As David Brody, former Chair of the Board of Trustees stated – "The process has to be better than the person". As the Faculty Senate continues next year under new leadership, we must remember the history and uphold our reputation. Ultimately, the discipline and the process of shared governance will continue to ensure productive and successful outcomes, regardless of the issue, at East Carolina University."

No questions were posed to Chair Walker at this time. Following Chair Walker's remarks, the Faculty Senators gave her a standing ovation.

Professor Mike Brown (Psychology) then proposed a commendation for Professor Marianna Walker, Chair of the Faculty, that read as follows:

"WHEREAS, Professor Marianna Walker has served as Chair of the Faculty from Fall 2009 through Spring 2012, and

WHEREAS, Professor Marianna Walker has devoted considerable time and energy to actions that benefit the entire faculty of East Carolina University, and

WHEREAS, Professor Marianna Walker has upheld the core principles of academic freedom and shared governance, and

WHEREAS, Professor Marianna Walker has directed the successful review and revision of the entire contents of the Faculty Manual, and

WHEREAS, Professor Marianna Walker has provided steady leadership during the development and implementation of extensive changes to administrative and academic policies to facilitate ECU's reaccreditation process, and

WHEREAS, Professor Marianna Walker has overseen the reorganization of existing and the creation of new Faculty Senate committees, and

WHEREAS, Professor Marianna Walker has offered skillful leadership during a severe budget

crisis, and

WHEREAS, Professor Marianna Walker has contributed an evenhanded perspective during the continuing activities of the Program Prioritization Committee, and

WHEREAS, Professor Marianna Walker has integrated input from Faculty Senate committees and administrative committees, thus enhancing shared governance at ECU, and

WHEREAS, Professor Marianna Walker has admirably represented the faculty of the university at meetings with the university administration, the Board of Trustees, the Faculty Assembly, and other meetings with external and internal publics, and

WHEREAS, Professor Marianna Walker has efficaciously led the Faculty Senate through three full years of work.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that Professor Marianna Walker is commended for her exemplary leadership as Chair of the Faculty.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that we, the members of East Carolina University's Faculty Senate, hereby express our deep appreciation to Professor Marianna Walker for her balance, professionalism, tireless leadership and supererogatory service during her tenure as Faculty Chair of East Carolina University.”

There was no discussion and the Faculty Senate overwhelmingly endorsed the commendation for Professor Marianna Walker, Chair of the Faculty, and passed the resolution by acclamation.

RESOLUTION #12-54

F. Wendy Sharer, [Quality Enhancement Program](#) (QEP) Director and David Weismiller, SACS Liaison and Associate Provost for IPAR

Associate Provost Weismiller provided a brief introduction reminder about the reaffirmation of accreditation-compliance certificate due 9/10/12. He mentioned that by this time next year the SACS review committee will have visited the campus and departed. The Compliance Certificate is almost complete and Dr. Weismiller thanked Rita Reeves and almost 250 faculty contributors for their work on the report. The report will be completed by July 1 and will go to the Chancellor for final review before being sent to the peer institutions in September. The second aspect of the effort was an opportunity to work on one area of improvement that would span many academic areas. Last year the university spent almost nine months to decide on the topic for the QEP. Writing across the curriculum was selected as the topic that would be invested in and the final report for the QEP is to be selected approximately six weeks prior to the site visit next year. Dr. Weismiller introduced Professor Sharer who is leading the Writing Across the Curriculum program

Professor Sharer then provided a report on the QEP Component of SACS Reaffirmation starting with a reminder that there is a QEP website as well as a QEP blog. In Fall 2011 the 35 members of the QEP council did a great deal of work and among other things they reviewed best practices in writing, and surveyed students, faculty, alumni and professionals about the kinds of writing that students need to do to succeed. A list of seven writing outcomes have been identified that all students should achieve by the time that they graduate. Those outcomes are on the ECU website and Professor

Sharer requested feedback on what is written there; several initiatives are also included on the website that would contribute to improved writing skills of our students. The initiatives can be grouped into three main categories : student support, faculty support , and curriculum enhancement.

The key to student support is providing additional instruction in writing; central to this is an enhanced Writing Center, within the constraints of the budget. Professor Sharer reported that the libraries had offered wonderful support in these plans. New tutoring services, especially for graduate students, are also being planned. There is a plan to imbed writing tutors in writing intensive classes and the development of smaller more intensive sections of English 1100 for students who are having a hard time moving from high school to college level writing. Finally, a more robust website, with writing resources for student to use is planned.

In terms of faculty support there are plans for expanding the Writing Across the Curriculum Academy, and supporting on going writing communities that will bring together instructors who teach writing foundation courses like English 1100 and 1200 and instructors who teach writing intensive courses in the disciplines. Web-based resources are also envisioned to support faculty.

In terms of curriculum enhancement, there is a desire to develop a Sophomore writing program that would move English 1200 to the Sophomore year. This course would become a bridge between introductory analytic and expository writing that is learned in English 1100 and the more advanced writing that will become a part of the curriculum that the students will be exposed to in their more advanced classes in their chosen disciplines. It is hoped that this effort will close the gap that now exists and will help make connections between the introductory writing and the advanced writing skills that they must acquire prior to graduation. Currently the students do not see the connections between English 1100 and 1200 and thus they do not transfer the learning in the foundation course. Faculty also reported in the surveys that were taken that they were not aware of what was being taught in these two preparatory writing courses. Students switch majors on a regular basis and the assignments will be kept broad enough that the students can function in a variety of majors. English 1200 will attempt to familiarize what writing will look like in their possible major through assignments that ask for analysis and careful reading and will help the students become more proficient in the writing styles that differ in how information is sensitized and condensed in their chosen major. The difference between how different curriculums combine words and images will also be described in the revised course. Students will also be cohorted so that learning communities can be used to help them make the progress that is desired. The cohorts will be broad such as “writing about arts and the humanities”, or “writing about health sciences”.

Professor Rigsby (Geological Sciences) stated that she appreciated the report and asked, in reference to the Sophomore level class that may replace English 1200 later, how would that work in the student progression to graduation . She asked how would this work with students and was it high enough?

Professor Sharer replied that “yes”, it would modify the way that information was conveyed to the point that English 1200 would probably be come English 2200. Generally students have already declared a major during their Sophomore year. There are two categories of writing that will be used: one is analytical and the other is synthesizing common modes of writing in a field of study.

Chair Walker thanked Professor Sharer for her excellent leadership on this activity for SACS.

G. David Siegel and Mary Beth Corbin, Co-Chairs of UNIV 1000 Committee

Professor Siegel noted that since last September their committee had been analyzing the ECU version of the first year seminar. He noted that the final report from the UNIV 1000 Committee will be due to the Provost by May 1st. He stated that the report is still very much a work in progress which is why there is no copy of the report before the Senators at this meeting. The shortcomings of COAD 1000 were defined by the committee and some frameworks have been suggested so that all first year students are able to benefit from the course no matter what their preparation or education level is at that point. The Foundations of Excellence self-study disclosed that the hallmark of a truly excellent first year experience is integrated, comprehensive, realistic and finally it must be integrated into the mainstream and not to the periphery of the course offerings for freshmen. There is a variety of opinions about the development of students during the period of greatest transition, and it is hoped that the report will be a nice stimulus for additional discussion what could be a truly excellent first year experience for students. The final report will include differences of opinion from members of the committee as well as invite differences of opinion from a larger campus conversation.

Professor Seigel continued in his comments by stating that academic success is defined as greater than mere retention; it includes the life of the mind and interest and engagement with different ideas and intellectual life in general. One of the ways this can be done is to help unveil academic culture, which is often completely impenetrable to many freshmen. The rules of the game must be demystified and what academics value must be clearly described to these students. What professors do in their research and when they teach needs to be clearly defined as part of the "life of the minds". The public seems to also be unclear about the value of the university; so this experience is intended to help with the overall community understanding of the contribution of academics.

Mary Beth Corbin described the two pathways that the committee recommended pursuing which include five broad objectives. There are four different types of Freshmen Seminars across the nation. The first one is college transition or extended transition model which is what COAD 1000 is at ECU. The second type is an academic theme seminar which either has a uniform or special content area. The third type is discipline based, and the fourth is the least popular is the remedial or study skills theme seminar. The majority of programs now are the extended seminar, like at ECU, but the academic theme seminar is becoming more popular. There is also a hybrid theme version that is some combination of the four different types. The committee has recommended that the university adopt a seminar with a limited number of pathways to a common set of developmental objectives for all first year students. There are two course models that can meet these objectives. The first recommended model is the college transition or extended transition with an increased in academic requirements and a change in course title to UNIVERSITY (UNIV) 1000. The course would focus on the psycho-social integration of first year students into the college community. Special sections would be offered for transfer students, African males, International students and others. Sections may be taught by a disciplinary faculty member or Student Affairs educators like counselors, campus wellness experts and other staff. The second model is the academic hybrid seminar also called the emerging scholar's seminar. This seminar would introduce students to academic culture and use small group exploration of a discipline based theme. ESS courses would be hybrid courses designed to explicitly help students thrive and achieve their academic potential in the university environment by combining academic and student success components. Faculty members and staff from Academic Affairs and the Counseling Center will combine to develop the program and co-teach the classes as a seminar. Engagement with the first year students with the faculty is important to their adjustment, but a "one size fits all" seminar will not be the appropriate model.

Professor McFadden (Education) asked both Professor Siegel and Co-Chair Corbin for a copy of the final report on UNIV 1000. Professor Siegel stated that he did not know what the distribution would be once the Committee reported to the Provost. Professor McFadden then requested that the UNIV 1000 report be on the agenda for the first Fall Faculty Senate Meeting so that faculty could receive an update on the activities. Professor Siegel agreed.

Professor Bauer (English) stated that for every hour a student attended a college class, they should study 3 hours. She understood students' work commitment but did not think that students understood the entire University experience and opportunities of the University education. She expressed her hope that this group would consider using the freshman year to explain all of the opportunities of the University education.

Professor Morehead (Chemistry) stated that he had developed a couple of the new COAD classes and found the experience to be positive and engaging for students compared to the past COAD 1000 setup. Since the course gets academic credit, it should have more interaction with faculty and that component may be missing. He stated that we need to strengthen the interaction with faculty if we are going to strengthen the course.

Professor Theurer (Music) stated that the University had two different tracks to reach students.

Mrs. Corbin stated that one seminar does not count for academic credit. Some students need a transition to college skills and some may experience transition difficulties that do not relate to academic engagement.

Professor Siegel (Education) stated that the Committee was looking to make these experiences more academic. COAD 1000 should involve more academic experiences. Faculty who have taught that course in the past can provide more details on what has been taught. The dichotomy between these two can be bridged.

Professor Morehead (Chemistry) asked what was the effect of the various models that the Committee was exploring? He suggested that the UNIV 1000 report being given to Provost Sheerer on May 1 and shared with the Faculty Senate in the Fall should include those models.

Professor Cooper (Health and Human Performance) thanked the Committee and noted that this was a curriculum matter within the purview of faculty. He then asked would the UNIV 1000 report go to a Faculty Senate academic committee for review and action before anything is finalized? Professor Siegel replied yes, certainly before ECU embarks on radical changes to the first year seminar. He stated that any recommended curriculum matters contained in the UNIV 1000 report would go through the individual academic unit committees before being offered as special topics in a semester.

Chair Walker clarified that the Committee was just presenting an initial report to the Provost and that this was the first opportunity for the faculty and the Division of Student Affairs to work together on this important matter. She stated that whatever happened after the UNIV 1000 report was presented to the Provost would follow normal curriculum approval channels.

Professor Rigsby (Geological Sciences) stated that almost all students need a college transition fit and an academic fit. She reiterated that anything that happens from this day forward from the UNIV

1000 Committee would be given to the appropriate committees of the Faculty Senate and asked to review the information even before a new curriculum proposal is comes in. She suggested that early in the Fall semester, forums be held to assist faculty and others in the new way of doing things.

Professor Reynolds (Academic Library Services) suggested that a personal financial component be provided for the students noting that students in their freshman year usually make terrible financial decisions and leave school unfortunately with credit card and college debt. He thinks that this was just as important as time management, study skills, etc. The students need to pay down their debt within the first five years after graduating. Mrs. Corbin responded that yes, the current COAD 1000 does currently address financial responsibility.

H. Question Period

Professor Popke (Geography) stated that during the Chancellor's remarks about the yearlong activities of the PPC, he described the activities as a faculty-led process. Professor Popke stated that from his perspective, it did not reflect the way he had experienced the work of the PPC. He appreciated the opportunities given by Ron Mitchelson and others to address items but noted that the PPC determined the options for possible reorganization, not faculty. He noted that every faculty member of his academic unit were against one of the main options of breaking up the College of Arts and Sciences and that under a faculty-led process that option would not still be on the table. Professor Popke then asked Chancellor Ballard what weight would he give to faculty opinion once he received the final PPC report? Chancellor Ballard responded that he was not sure until he saw what the final report was. He had no desire to do sweeping changes within the University; however, if ECU has severe budget cuts and cuts had already been taken from the 25% of services and divisions that did not have academic functions, further cuts must come from the worst places deep within academics. The dilemma with the 75% - 25% problem was that it was not possible to cut anymore from ITCS, Maintenance, Housekeeping, etc.

Professor Given (Foreign Languages and Literatures) stated that, in considering a potential STEM college, he noticed that most of the faculty against the change spoke loudly but stated that there were some voices that supported it. Whoever is pushing the STEM college remains anonymous and the push drive is unknown to faculty. He then asked the Chancellor would there be open and honest discussion as to why the unidentified voices think these changes are necessary? Would he support an open and transparent discussion on the final recommendations so that faculty know who was actually leading the possible splitting of the College of Arts and Sciences? Would faculty have an opportunity to express their opinions on the final reorganization document? Chancellor Ballard replied that he could not promise to have additional forums, etc. on the final report if the budget worsened, although he doesn't see that happening at the present time.

Professor Rigsby (Geological Sciences) stated that splitting up the College of Arts and Sciences requires discussion and a vote of the Faculty Senate, as stated in the *ECU Faculty Manual*. She then asked the Chancellor if he promised to follow the Faculty Manual in these processes? Chancellor Ballard replied yes.

IV. Unfinished Business

There was no new business to come before the Faculty Senate at this time.

V. Report of Graduate Council and Standing University Academic Committees

Faculty Senate Minutes

April 17, 2012

Page 14.

A. Graduate Council, Terry West

Professor Terry West (Biology), Chair of the Graduate Council, presented curriculum and academic matters contained in the Graduate Curriculum Committee meeting minutes of [March 21, 2012](#) and [March 28, 2012](#) which include curricular actions within the College of Allied Health Sciences, College of Nursing, College of Education, College of Health and Human Performance, College of Technology and Computer Science, School of Communication, Department of Physics, Department of Biology, Department of Economics, Department of Geography, and Coastal Resources Management Program.

There was no discussion and the curriculum and academic matters contained in the Graduate Curriculum Committee meeting minutes of [March 21, 2012](#) and [March 28, 2012](#) which include curricular actions within the College of Allied Health Sciences, College of Nursing, College of Education, College of Health and Human Performance, College of Technology and Computer Science, School of Communication, Department of Physics, Department of Biology, Department of Economics, Department of Geography, and Coastal Resources Management Program were accepted as formal faculty advice to the Chancellor. **RESOLUTION #12-55**

B. University Curriculum Committee, Donna Kain

Professor Donna Kain (English), Chair of the Committee, presented curriculum and academic matters contained in meeting minutes of [March 22, 2012](#), which include curricular actions within Department of History, School of Art and Design, Classical Studies Program, Department of English, Department of Geological Sciences, Department of Chemistry; College of Business, College of Education, College of Health and Human Performance; and [April 12, 2012](#) (5:30 meeting), which include matters related to revision of committee guidelines and forms.

In her remarks she explained how the activities of the April 12 Committee meeting were divided and how curriculum matters handled by the Committee earlier in the day would be considered by the Faculty Senate in September 2012.

There was no discussion and the curriculum and academic matters contained in meeting minutes of [March 22, 2012](#), which include curricular actions within Department of History, School of Art and Design, Classical Studies Program, Department of English, Department of Geological Sciences, Department of Chemistry; College of Business, College of Education, College of Health and Human Performance; and [April 12, 2012](#) (5:30 meeting), which included matters related to revision of committee guidelines and forms were approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #12-56**

C. Unit Code Screening Committee, Patricia Anderson

Professor Patricia Anderson (Education), Chair of the Committee first presented the additional proposed revisions to the Allied Health Sciences Unit Code of Operation. There was no discussion and the additional proposed revisions to the Allied Health Sciences Unit Code of Operation were approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #12-57**

Professor Anderson then presented both the revised [Academic Library Services](#) Unit Code of Operation and revised [College of Education](#) Unit Code of Operation. There was no discussion and both the revised [Academic Library Services](#) Unit Code of Operation and revised [College of Education](#) Unit Code of Operation were approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #12-58**

D. Calendar Committee

Faculty Senate Minutes

April 17, 2012

Page 15.

Professor Charles Lesko (Technology and Computer Science), Chair of the Committee, presented first proposed revisions to the Summer 2012 University Calendar. He explained that there were two days for the mid summer break.

Professor Christian (Business) spoke against the changes to Summer 2012 calendar moving up the start date of May 14, stating that students would not know that school starts on a day earlier. He noted that changing the calendar now at such a late date was going to be a nightmare for both students and faculty and should not be allowed. Faculty, who did not know about the internal changes, might have already written their course syllabi already. Changing the start date of the calendar that was approved last year occurred in February 2012. The information on the university website does not include the change and thus will be a source of misinformation. He also questioned how the Calendar Committee or administrators could change a start date without obtaining the Faculty Senate approval.

Angela Anderson, University Registrar, noted that there was a request made via email to the Calendar Committee to change dates in the calendar earlier in the Spring semester due to various reasons, and like all other changes to the calendars handled in the past, the dates were approved editorially by the Committee Chair via email. She also noted that financial aid used the revised date when distributing information to student earlier this year. Changes have been made to the tuition and financial aid date of the beginning of summer school; this information has been sent to the students and the Department of Education

Professor Roberts (Philosophy) asked why the Faculty Senate was being asked to change the start date for Summer 2012?

Professor Lesko replied that the change in start date was a clerical error , and that the Calendar Committee did not approve the change in start dates for summer school. He stated that there was no internal procedure for handling "requests for change in calendars".

Professor Rigsby (Geological Sciences) expressed support for the motion against changing the Summer 2012 start date.

Professor Roberts (Philosophy) asked who approved the sources' request to change the calendar. He stated that the Calendar Committee had never voted to change the date and it seemed that there was a typo or a clerical error that had caused this problem.

Registrar Anderson replied that there was a request for an editorial change due to the late processing fee; in that request there was also a note about the late start date for summer school. There needs to be a formalized process for editorial revisions of the calendar so this does not occur again in the future.

Professor Howard (Communication) asked what were the material financial consequences of the University to the Department of Education.

Registrar Anderson replied that she could not speak for financial aid and did not know.

Professor Reisch (Business) asked about the funding and how moving the date one date later could have any impact.

Professor Given (Foreign Languages and Literatures) asked for clarification on what was the Senate being asked to vote on right now were the changes that show in red on the electronic version of the minutes.

Professor Lesko clarified the committee's activities and felt that there were only 2 options. Either knock the day off at the end with 2 days in the middle of the summer. The impact to students would be too great to change it back to the Tuesday start date. The committee voted to the lesser of two evils knocking a day off at the end instead of changing the start date from a Monday back to Tuesday as originally approved. He reiterated that the neither the committee, the Faculty Senate, nor the Chancellor has approved the change though financial aid had started work based on the date shown erroneously.

Professor Christian (Business) noted that he felt changing the Summer 2012 start date this close to the start of the session should not be considered a clerical change. He also questioned how would students know the change in dates. He then reiterated that changes to University approval calendars should not be changed without approval of the Faculty Senate and Chancellor and moved that the Summer 2012 University calendar remain unchanged: a Tuesday start date.

Professor Brown (Psychology) called the question.

Following discussion, the Faculty Senate rejected the proposed revisions to the Summer 2012 University Calendar, leaving the official start date for First Summer Session on Tuesday, May 15 as shown on the official university calendar. **RESOLUTION #12-59**

Professor Lesko then presented the proposed Summer 2013 – Spring 2014 University Calendars. There was no discussion and the proposed Summer 2013 – Spring 2014 University Calendars were approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #12-60**

E. Admission and Retention Policies Committee

Professor Joseph Thomas (Academic Library Services), Chair of the Committee, presented first the proposed revisions to the *ECU Undergraduate Catalog*, Section II. Admission and Readmission, subsection Readmission and Section V. Academic Regulations, Academic Eligibility Standards, subsection Nontraditional Student Suspension. He asked that both Attachment IV and V be considered together since make changes that create consistency with other policies that have been made previously. The titles of the policies would be consistent if the report is accepted.

Following discussion, the proposed revisions to the *ECU Undergraduate Catalog*, Section II. Admission and Readmission, subsection Readmission and Section V. Academic Regulations, Academic Eligibility Standards, subsection Nontraditional Student Suspension were approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #12-61**

Professor Thomas then presented proposed revisions to the *ECU Undergraduate Catalog*, Section VI. Academic Regulations, subsection Attendance and Participation. This change allows the Dean of Students' office to excuse absences under certain conditions. This was caused by the fact that some professors were not granting absences for required ROTC training.

Professor Roberts (Philosophy) stated that ECU should support military students. He asked if the Dean of Students could currently excuse an absence for military training if the instructor of record did not do so. Professor Thomas reported that he was not aware that this has happened to date.

Professor Brown (Psychology) asked if the request had come from the Dean of Students. Professor Thomas replied no.

Professor Brown (Psychology) asked if the Dean of Students was in favor of this change? Professor Thomas said he did not know the answer to this question.

Following discussion, the proposed revisions to the *ECU Undergraduate Catalog*, Section VII. Academic Regulations, subsection Attendance and Participation were approved as presented.

RESOLUTION #12-62

Professor Thomas then presented a proposed new subsection within the *ECU Undergraduate Catalog*, Section I. The University entitled Student Academic Freedom. He stated that the proposed new subsection before subsection Academic Integrity Policy was being offered to formalize the University's support of the rights guaranteed by the UNC Code sections 600 and 608.

Chair Walker asked if this change was also part of the SACS requirements. Professor Thomas indicated that this was the case.

Professor Roberts (Philosophy) asked what was the specific SACS requirement relating to this topic? Professor Sprague (Physics) replied that one of the SACS requirements affirms that ECU supports academic freedom for students.

Following a brief discussion, the proposed new subsection within the *ECU Undergraduate Catalog*, Section I. The University, entitled Student Academic Freedom was approved as presented.

RESOLUTION #12-63

Professor Thomas then presented the proposed revision to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part III. Academic Freedom to include a link to the proposed Statement on Student Academic Freedom. No changes are proposed although the link is proposed.

There was no discussion and the proposed revision to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part III. Academic Freedom to include a link to the Statement on Student Academic Freedom (once approved) was approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #12-64**

F. Faculty Governance Committee

Professor George Bailey (Philosophy), Chair of the Committee, presented first proposed revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part I. Introduction has been rewritten a copy is available to the Senators; the floor is open for comments.

Professor Given (Foreign Languages and Literatures) asked in reference to the Manual interpretations, did the process change since the Faculty Senate was not noted in the normal procedures detailed. He asked if there should be language addressing the process of approval in this report

Professor Bailey (Philosophy) responded that this is what the next to last sentence was supposed to do. He said that what happens actually is that an ambiguity is found close to the deadline.

Chair Walker noted that Faculty Governance also has responsible for such interpretations.

Following a brief discussion, the proposed revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part I. Introduction were approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #12-65**

Professor Bailey then presented proposed revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part II. University Organization, Subsection III. University Policy. There was no discussion and the proposed revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part II. University Organization, Subsection III. University Policy were approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #12-66**

Professor Bailey then presented proposed revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part II. University Organization, Subsection IV. Academic Policy. There was no discussion and the proposed revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part II. University Organization, Subsection IV. Academic Policy were approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #12-67**

Professor Bailey then presented proposed revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part XIII. Promotion and Tenure Timeline stating that the final revisions were just completed earlier in the day. He noted that the Committee had been asked to add a reference to a footnote to address 12-month faculty members.

Professor Ballard (Child Development and Family Relations) reminded the Senate that there was still confusion about assistant professors going up for promotion and tenure and wanted to call this to the attention of the Faculty Governance Committee Chair to address when reviewing Appendix D in the Fall.

Following a brief discussion, the proposed revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part XIII. Promotion and Tenure Timeline were approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #12-68**

Professor Bailey then presented proposed revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Appendix A. Faculty Constitution and By-Laws of East Carolina University.

Professor Given (Foreign Languages and Literatures) asked what was the justification for a restriction limiting a faculty member from serving as a regular member on more than one standing University academic committee when one can be appointed as the Senate or Faculty Chair representative to more than one committee. Why could the professor not be an ex-officio member? Professor Bailey replied that the current Appendix A does not make that restriction clear so the Committee chose to clarify the process better providing opportunities to all faculty to serve if they are interested. He noted that in the 1970's there was a small group of faculty who ran most of the committees and did all of the work. Thus they had a great deal of influence. Now that would be impossible given the amount of work that each standing committee completes in one academic year. He agreed that it would be best to allow faculty more access to the various University committees, including administrative and appellate committees as well.

Professor Roberts (Philosophy) reminded Senators of the past experience when a faculty member was denied service on more than one standing University Academic committee due to this statement

in Appendix A. He noted that the revision now makes it clear what the limits are in reference to service.

Professor Rigsby (Geological Sciences) spoke in favor of the proposed revisions to Appendix A stressing the difficulty each year getting enough faculty members to serve on committees. She noted that if we don't limit those faculty most eager to serve, we would have the same people on the committees over and over again limiting broad faculty representation.

Following discussion, the Senators expressed support of the proposed revisions. All proposed amendments to the Faculty Constitution require two readings, so the Faculty Senate will be asked to vote on the proposed revisions at the April 24 scheduled Senate meeting prior to submission to the general faculty for approval. The Chancellor will not act on the revised appendix until the faculty have ratified this at Fall Faculty Convocation on August 20, 2012.

G. Research/Creative Activity Grants Committee

Professor Britton Theurer (Music), Chair of the Committee, presented formal faculty advice on the proposed Allocation of Research Space Regulation. The 80th percentile measure led the committee to be concerned about how this measure would be applied across curriculums. There was no discussion and the formal faculty advice on the proposed Allocation of Research Space Regulation was approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #12-69**

H. Committee on Committees

Professor Catherine Rigsby (Geological Sciences), Chair of the Committee presented the first reading of proposed revisions to the Standing University Academic Research/Creative Activity Grants Committee Charge.

Professor Theurer (Music) expressed his intentions to offer revisions to the committee charge at its second reading of the revised committee charge. Vice Chancellor Horns asked that the committee please address the composition of the committee which currently limits the number of professional school faculty.

I. Faculty Welfare Committee

Professor Ken Ferguson (Philosophy), Chair of the Committee, presented first the proposed revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part VI. General Personnel Policies, Section I. Employment Policies, Subsection J. Salary Policies.

Professor Rigsby (Geological Sciences) stated that in reference to total compensation, it used to reference a cap that may not exceed 133% of their annual salary. Professor Ferguson restated what Vice Chancellor Niswander stated in reference to the cap noting: "This entire section should be removed. 1) If we are to truly encourage faculty to engage in work that creates alternative streams of income, we need to appropriately compensate them and not create barriers to such. 2) If we are basically approving all requests now, why have a signoff that means nothing, creating work for no reason. It would be acceptable to modify the section to apply only to those who have a federal grant where the 133% rule makes a difference".

Following a brief discussion, the proposed revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part VII. General Personnel Policies, Section I. Employment Policies, Subsection J. Salary Policies were approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #12-70**

Professor Ferguson then presented Formal Faculty Advice on the Current Faculty Spousal and Domestic Partner Hiring Standard Operating Procedure.

Professor Roberts (Philosophy) stated that this is only articulating what is already happening and wondered how does it relate to the UNC policy? Professor Roper (Medicine) stated that the Committee did not believe that this was inconsistent with any UNC policies.

Professor Given (Foreign Languages and Literatures) – stated he was bothered by the current wording (*if the individual is a finalist...then the waiver must be obtained*). Why doesn't it state that the other department must also want the spouse. Professor Ferguson stated that the policy states that no spouse could be forced on any academic unit.

Professor Bauer (English) spoke in favor of the proposed language and attempt to alter the process. She notes that she sees faculty leave every year because of a lack of job for spouses and she thinks ECU needs to work collaboratively with other academic units to hire the best possible colleagues.

Professor Roper (Medicine) spoke in support of the proposal and noted that this process only works if both academic units are in agreement with the spousal hire.

Following discussion, the formal faculty advice on the current Faculty Spousal and Domestic Partner Hiring Standard Operating Procedure was approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #12-71**

J. Academic Awards Committee

Professor Pat Royal (Allied Health Sciences), Vice Chair of the Committee, presented proposed revisions to the Procedures for Annual Lifetime and Five-year Achievement University Research/Creative Activity Awards. She noted that revisions have been made to procedures to create more clarity and consistency. The first change is a change of date for materials to be submitted to September to be the same as other awards. The second change is to identify that two awards will be given, and the final change is procedural in nature.

Professor Roberts (Philosophy) stated that it seemed odd to him to give someone two awards in the same year.

Professor Royal clarified that the procedures outlined were for lifetime and five-year research awards for two people for each award if money is available.

Following a brief discussion, the proposed revisions to the Procedures for Annual Lifetime and Five-year Achievement University Research/Creative Activity Awards were approved as presented.

RESOLUTION #12-72

K. Educational Policies and Planning Committee

Professor Scott Gordon (Health and Human Performance), Chair of the Committee presented the curriculum and academic program matters included in the [April 13, 2012](#) and [April 14, 2012](#) meeting minutes, including a request for revisions to the [Concentrations in the MAEd in Mathematics](#), Department of Mathematics, Science, and Instructional Technology Education, within the College of Education, request for Authorization to Establish a PhD Program in [Economics](#), Department of Economics, within the College of Arts and Sciences and two unit academic program reviews including

the Department of [Geography \(response to external review recommendations\)](#) and Department of [Recreation and Leisure Studies \(response to external review recommendations\)](#).

There was no discussion and the curriculum and academic program matters included in the [April 13, 2012](#) and [April 14, 2012](#) meeting minutes, including a request for revisions to the [Concentrations in the MAEd in Mathematics](#) within the Department of Mathematics, Science, and Instructional Technology Education, request for Authorization to Establish a PhD Program in [Economics](#), within the Department of Economics, and two unit academic program reviews including the Department of [Geography \(response to external review recommendations\)](#) and Department of [Recreation and Leisure Studies \(response to external review recommendations\)](#) were approved as presented.

RESOLUTION #12-73

L. Foundations Curriculum and Instructional Effectiveness Committee Professor Linda Wolfe (Anthropology), Chair of the Committee first presented the [Removal of Foundation Curriculum Course Credit](#) for CHEM 2770 Biological Chemistry and CHEM 2771 Biological Chemistry Laboratory; [Removal of Foundation Curriculum Course Credit](#) for ANTH 4050 Psychological Anthropology, ANTH 4054 Anthropology of Religion, ANTH 4253 Social Anthropology and ANTH 4260 Cultural Ecology; [Removal of Foundation Curriculum Course Credit](#) for HIST 3005 Selected Topics in History, HIST 3333 Biography in History, HIST 4550 Honors and HIST 4551 Honors; [Removal of Foundation Curriculum Course Credit](#) for ECON 3030, ECON 3144, ECON 3244, ECON 3323, ECON 3343, ECON 3353, ECON 3365, ECON 3420, ECON 3630, ECON 3750, ECON 3855, ECON 3960, ECON 4020, ECON 4214, ECON 4320, ECON 4373, ECON 4430 and ECON 4850; [Removal of Foundation Curriculum Course Credit](#) for FREN 2440, FREN 2441, FREN 2442, FREN 2443, FREN 3500, FREN 3555, FREN 3556, FREN 3557, FREN 3558, FREN 3560, GERM 3340, GERM 3400, GERM 3500, GERM 3520, GERM 3530, GERM 3540, GERM 3550, GRK 3001, GRK 3002, GRK 4001, GRK 4002, LATN 3001, LATN 3002, LATN 4001, LATN 4002, SPAN 4555, SPAN 4556, SPAN 4557, SPAN 4558, SPAN 4560, SPAN 4561, SPAN 4562 and SPAN 4563.

There was no discussion and the removal of foundation curriculum course credit was approved for all courses as requested. **RESOLUTION #12-74**

Professor George Bailey (Philosophy), a member of the Committee then presented a recommendation establishing Domestic and Global Diversity Course Requirements ; he stated that attachment 19 has been modified to a minor extent and that stated that it would be helpful if the goals for diversity courses could be looked up. Kent State was a model for this statement on diversity though the language has been changed to be quite generic.

Professor Popke (Geography) spoke in favor of this report since it is clearly worded and the proposed recommendation noting that the task was not overwhelming and he urged faculty support on this.

Professor Frank (Technology and Computer Science) asked if this would be effective Fall 2013 and included in the *University Undergraduate Catalog*? Professor Bailey replied yes, students entering in Fall 2013 would be expected to do this.

Following discussion, the recommendation establishing Domestic and Global Diversity Course Requirements was approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #12-75**

Professor Wolfe then presented proposed revisions to *ECU Faculty Manual*, Appendix C. Section III. Evaluation in reference to the Student Perception of Teaching Survey that the effort is to show the different way that teaching effectiveness could be expressed and utilized.

Professor Rigsby (Geological Sciences) asked if the Committee intended that the faculty member use all of those suggestions or was it being left up to the unit to decide?

Professor Brown replied yes, faculty must use all of the items listed.

Professor Morehead (Chemistry) moved revising the last sentence in #1 to read "*Teaching must be evaluated using multiple methods selected from the list below.*". The motion passed.

Following a brief discussion, the proposed revisions to *ECU Faculty Manual*, Appendix C. Section III. Evaluation in reference to the Student Perception of Teaching Survey was approved as amended.

RESOLUTION #12-76

M. Libraries Committee

Professor Cheryl McFadden (Education), Chair of the Committee asked the body for support of a Letter to the Chancellor Requesting Continued Involvement of the Committee and Library Administration in all phases of design, planning and decision-making of future space needs.

There was no discussion and the body endorsed the letter and action of the Committee.

RESOLUTION #12-77

Professor McFadden then presented for information only, both [University Library Budgets](#).

Professor McKinnon (Interior Design and Merchandising) stated that, in reference to funding equations and formulas, how much funding does the library have under its control? Provost Sheerer replied that there was a separate allocation for libraries and usually left untouched, however decisions were made in the past few years to take money from the libraries allocation to address the budget situation.

Agenda Item VI. New Business

Professor Mike Felts (Health and Human Performance) moved to request the Senate to consider new business relating to the University Athletics Committee and endorsement of Professor David Dosser as the continued Faculty Athletics Representative, as follows:

"The minutes of the April 12, 2012 University Athletic Committee include a recommendation to have the Faculty Senate endorse the Chancellor's reappointment of Dr. David Dosser as the Faculty Athletics Representative for East Carolina University. The members of the Committee have received very positive feedback and reported their own positive impressions of Dr. Dosser arrived at through considerable interactions and observation of his significant efforts. The text of the National Collegiate Athletic Association Bylaws related to the Faculty Athletics Representative is included below.

4.02.2 Faculty Athletics Representative. A faculty athletics representative is a member of an institution's faculty or administrative staff who is designated by the institution's president or chancellor or other appropriate entity to represent the institution and its faculty in the

institution's relationships with the NCAA and its conference(s), if any (see also Constitution 6.1.3). (Revised: 3/8/06)

6.1.3 provides the following guidance to its member institutions: "Faculty Athletics representative. A member institution shall designate an individual to serve as faculty athletics representative. An individual so designated after January 12, 1989, shall be a member of the institution's faculty or an administrator who holds faculty rank and shall not hold an administrative or coaching position in the athletics department. Duties of the faculty athletics representative shall be determined by the member institution. (*Adopted: 1/11/89*)"

The ECU Faculty Athletics Representative position is described in brief below and in more detail in the [ECU Faculty Athletics Representative Position Description](#). The Faculty Athletics Representative (FAR) provides oversight and advice in the administration of East Carolina University Athletics program and plays a strategic role to ensure athletic integrity, institutional control of intercollegiate athletics, and enhancement of the student-athlete experience. The FAR is appointed by the Chancellor for a three-year term. The position is provided with .50 release from teaching duties. Representative duties/responsibilities:

- a) Periodically reviews appropriate records to ensure that decisions related to admissions, academic advising, evaluation of academic performance, and the extent of academic support services are made in ways that are consistent with the primary academic mission of East Carolina University.
- b) Provides advice to the Chancellor and Provost that reflects the traditional values of the faculty, and which is rooted in the academic ethic of East Carolina University.
- c) Serves on the University Athletics Committee.
- d) Reports regularly to the faculty senate regarding matters of academic integrity, academic preparation, and other matters related to the intercollegiate athletics program.
- e) Represents ECU at C-USA meetings four times a year.
- f) Promotes a balance between academics, athletics and the social lives of student athletes.

Following a vote to consider new business, Professor Roberts (Philosophy) moved approval of the endorsement. There was no discussion and the University Athletics Committee's request for endorsement of Professor David Dosser as the continued Faculty Athletics Representative was approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #12-78**

The meeting adjourned at 5:37 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Hunt McKinnon
Secretary of the Faculty
Department of Interior Design and Merchandising

Lori Lee
Faculty Senate

FACULTY SENATE RESOLUTIONS APPROVED AT THE APRIL 17, 2012 MEETING

12-54 Commendation for Professor Marianna Walker, Chair of the Faculty, as follows:
WHEREAS, Professor Marianna Walker has served as Chair of the Faculty from Fall 2009 through Spring 2012, and
WHEREAS, Professor Marianna Walker has devoted considerable time and energy to actions that benefit the entire faculty of East Carolina University, and
WHEREAS, Professor Marianna Walker has upheld the core principles of academic freedom and shared governance, and
WHEREAS, Professor Marianna Walker has directed the successful review and revision of the entire contents of the Faculty Manual, and
WHEREAS, Professor Marianna Walker has provided steady leadership during the development and implementation of extensive changes to administrative and academic policies to facilitate ECU's reaccreditation process, and
WHEREAS, Professor Marianna Walker has overseen the reorganization of existing and the creation of new Faculty Senate committees, and
WHEREAS, Professor Marianna Walker has offered skillful leadership during a severe budget crisis, and
WHEREAS, Professor Marianna Walker has contributed an evenhanded perspective during the continuing activities of the Program Prioritization Committee, and
WHEREAS, Professor Marianna Walker has integrated input from Faculty Senate committees and administrative committees, thus enhancing shared governance at ECU, and
WHEREAS, Professor Marianna Walker has admirably represented the faculty of the university at meetings with the university administration, the Board of Trustees, the Faculty Assembly, and other meetings with external and internal publics, and
WHEREAS, Professor Marianna Walker has efficaciously led the Faculty Senate through three full years of work.
THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that Professor Marianna Walker is commended for her exemplary leadership as Chair of the Faculty.
BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that we, the members of East Carolina University's Faculty Senate, hereby express our deep appreciation to Professor Marianna Walker for her balance, professionalism, tireless leadership and supererogatory service during her tenure as Faculty Chair of East Carolina University.

Disposition: Chancellor

12-55 Formal faculty advice on curriculum and academic matters contained in the Graduate Curriculum Committee meeting minutes of [March 21, 2012](#) and [March 28, 2012](#) which include curricular actions within the College of Allied Health Sciences, College of Nursing, College of Education, College of Health and Human Performance, College of Technology and Computer Science, School of Communication, Department of Physics, Department of Biology, Department of Economics, Department of Geography, and Coastal Resources Management Program.

Disposition: Chancellor

12-56 Curriculum and academic matters contained in meeting minutes of [March 22, 2012](#), which include curricular actions within Department of History, School of Art and Design, Classical

Studies Program, Department of English, Department of Geological Sciences, Department of Chemistry; College of Business, College of Education, College of Health and Human Performance; and [April 12, 2012](#) (5:30 meeting), which included matters related to revision of committee guidelines and forms.

Disposition: Chancellor

12-57 Additional revisions to the [Allied Health Sciences Unit Code of Operation](#).

Disposition: Chancellor

12-58 Revised [Academic Library Services](#) Unit Code of Operation and revised [College of Education](#) Unit Code of Operation.

Disposition: Chancellor

12-59 Rejected proposed revisions to the [Summer 2012 University Calendar](#), leaving the official start date for First Summer Session on Tuesday, May 15.

Disposition: Faculty Senate

12-60 Summer 2013 – Spring 2014 [University Calendars](#).

Disposition: Chancellor

12-61 Revisions to the *ECU Undergraduate Catalog*, Section II. Admission and Readmission, subsection Readmission and Section V. Academic Regulations, Academic Eligibility Standards, subsection Nontraditional Student Suspension, as follows:

(Additions are noted in **bold** print and deletions in ~~strikethrough~~.)

Subsection Readmission

“Nontraditional students admitted under the ~~Performance-Based Admission~~ **Nontraditional Students Admission** Policy who fail either to meet the GPA requirement or to satisfy the retention stipulations may not continue enrollment at East Carolina University except under the following conditions:

1. Students may attend summer school at East Carolina University to satisfy retention stipulations.
2. Students may be readmitted under the provisions of the ~~Special Readmission (Forgiveness)~~ **Readmission Under Forgiveness** Policy to resume progress toward satisfying retention stipulations.
3. Students may be readmitted after completing at an accredited college or university 30 semester hours or 45 quarter hours of transferable work with a minimum grade point average of 2.5 on all transferable work.

Duplicate credit will not be granted under any circumstances. In all cases the stipulations specified at the time of initial admission must be satisfied.

Following Suspension

See section on academic regulations, academic eligibility standards, for policies on readmission following suspension and the ~~Special Readmission~~ **Under Forgiveness** Policy.”

Subsection Nontraditional Student Suspension

“Nontraditional Student Suspension: This code indicates the status of a student who has become academically ineligible ~~because of failure to satisfy retention stipulations within the limits established by the Performance-Based Admission Policy.~~ For readmission options available to students in this status, see ~~Special Readmission (Forgiveness)~~ **Readmission Under Forgiveness** Policy under Readmission, below.”

Disposition: Chancellor

12-62 Revisions to the *ECU Undergraduate Catalog*, Section V. Academic Regulations, subsection Attendance and Participation, as follows:

(Additions are noted in **bold** print and deletions in ~~strike through~~.)

Attendance and Participation

“A student's participation in the work of a course is a precondition for receiving credit for the course. Students are expected to attend punctually all lecture and laboratory sessions and field experiences and to participate in course assignments and activities as described in the course syllabus. Absences are counted from the first class meeting after the student registers. Students registering late are expected to make up all missed assignments in a manner determined by the instructor.

Each instructor shall determine the class attendance policy for each of his or her courses as long as the instructor's policy does not conflict with university policy. The instructor's attendance policy will be provided to the class on a syllabus distributed at the first class meeting. Class attendance may be a criterion in determining a student's final grade in the course if the instructor provides a written statement to this effect in the course syllabus.

Students should consult with their instructors about all class absences. It is the responsibility of the student to notify the instructor immediately about class absences, to provide appropriate documentation for an absence, and discuss any missed class time, tests, or assignments. Except in the case of university excused absences, it is the decision of the instructor to excuse an absence or to allow for any additional time to make up missed tests or assignments. Excused absences should not lower a student's course grade, provided that the student, in a manner determined by the instructor, is able to make up the work that has been missed and is maintaining satisfactory progress in the course.

Student Health Services do not issue official written excuses for illness or injury, but will upon request at the time of the visit, provide a note confirming that the student has received care. In the event that the student is seriously ill or injured at the time of final examinations, Student Health Services on request by the student, may recommend a medical incomplete. A student who receives medical care from another licensed medical provider may take his or her instructor a note from that provider indicating that the student was too ill or injured to attend class, and listing the date(s) for which the student was unable to attend. The instructor may choose to accept these notes as evidence of excused absences.

The Dean of Students may authorize a university-excused absence in the following situations:

1. Student participation in authorized activities as an official representative of the university (i.e. athletic events, delegate to regional or national meetings or conferences, participation in university-sponsored performances).

2. Participation in other activities deemed by the Dean of Students to warrant an excused absence, **such as required military training**.
3. An extreme personal emergency about which the student is unable to speak directly to the instructor.
4. The death of an immediate family member (such as parent, sibling, spouse or child).
5. Student participation in religious holidays.

It is the student's responsibility to obtain verification of a university-excused absence by contacting the Dean of Students. Requests for university-excused absences should be submitted, whenever possible, to the Dean of Students at least a week prior to the scheduled absence. Requests submitted after the fact will be disapproved unless circumstances made prior approval impossible.

Instructors are expected to honor valid university excused absences and to provide reasonable and equitable means for students to make up work missed as a result of those absences. Students who anticipate missing 10% or more of class meeting time as a result of university-excused absences are required to receive approval from the instructor at the beginning of the semester. Student experiences that cannot be made up should be discussed at the onset of the course to ensure that continued enrollment is feasible while there is still the opportunity to drop the course within the schedule change period.

A student who believes that he or she has been treated unfairly concerning absences or has been misinformed by the instructor regarding that instructor's absence policy shall have the right to appeal. The appeal shall be in writing to the instructor's department chair or school director, and in the event the resolution is not satisfactory, the final decision rests with the academic dean."

Disposition: Chancellor

- 12-63 New subsection within the *ECU Undergraduate Catalog*, Section I. The University, entitled Student Academic Freedom, as follows:

Student Academic Freedom

"The University shall provide opportunity for its students to derive educational benefits through developing their intellectual capabilities, encouraging their increased wisdom and understanding, and enhancing their knowledge and experience applicable to the effective discharge of civic, professional, and social responsibilities. The University shall not abridge either the freedom of students engaged in the responsible pursuit of knowledge or their right to fair and impartial evaluation of their academic performance. All members of the university community shall share in the responsibility for maintaining an environment in which academic freedom flourishes and in which the rights and freedom of each member of the academic community are respected."

Disposition: Chancellor

- 12-64 Revision to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part III. Academic Freedom to include a link to the Statement on Student Academic Freedom (once approved).

Disposition: Chancellor

- 12-65 Revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, [Part I. Introduction](#).

Disposition: Chancellor

12-66 Revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part II. University Organization, Subsection III. [University Policy](#).

Disposition: Chancellor

12-67 Revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part II. University Organization, Subsection IV. [Academic Policy](#).

Disposition: Chancellor

12-68 Revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, [Part XIII. Promotion and Tenure Timeline](#).

Disposition: Chancellor

12-69 Formal faculty advice on the proposed [Allocation of Research Space Regulation](#).

Disposition: Chancellor

12-70 Revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part VI. General Personnel Policies, Section I. Employment Policies, Subsection J. [Salary Policies](#).

Disposition: Chancellor

12-71 Formal Faculty Advice on Current [Faculty Spousal and Domestic Partner Hiring Standard Operating Procedure](#).

Disposition: Chancellor

12-72 Revised [Procedures for Annual Lifetime and Five-year Achievement University Research/Creative Activity Awards](#).

Disposition: Chancellor

12-73 Curriculum and academic program matters included in the [April 13, 2012](#) and [April 14, 2012](#) meeting minutes, including a request for revisions to the [Concentrations in the MAEd in Mathematics](#) within the Department of Mathematics, Science, and Instructional Technology Education, request for Authorization to Establish a PhD Program in [Economics](#), within the Department of Economics, and two unit academic program reviews including the Department of [Geography](#) ([response to external review recommendations](#)) and Department of [Recreation and Leisure Studies](#) ([response to external review recommendations](#))

Disposition: Chancellor

12-74 [Removal of Foundation Curriculum Course Credit](#) for CHEM 2770 Biological Chemistry and CHEM 2771 Biological Chemistry Laboratory; [Removal of Foundation Curriculum Course Credit](#) for ANTH 4050 Psychological Anthropology, ANTH 4054 Anthropology of Religion, ANTH 4253 Social Anthropology and ANTH 4260 Cultural Ecology; [Removal of Foundation Curriculum Course Credit](#) for HIST 3005 Selected Topics in History, HIST 3333 Biography in History, HIST 4550 Honors and HIST 4551 Honors; [Removal of Foundation Curriculum Course Credit](#) for ECON 3030, ECON 3144, ECON 3244, ECON 3323, ECON 3343, ECON 3353, ECON 3365, ECON 3420, ECON 3630, ECON 3750, ECON 3855, ECON 3960, ECON 4020, ECON 4214, ECON 4320, ECON 4373, ECON 4430 and ECON 4850; [Removal of Foundation Curriculum Course Credit](#) for FREN 2440, FREN 2441, FREN 2442, FREN 2443, FREN 3500, FREN 3555, FREN 3556, FREN 3557, FREN 3558, FREN 3560, GERM 3340, GERM 3400,

GERM 3500, GERM 3520, GERM 3530, GERM 3540, GERM 3550, GRK 3001, GRK 3002, GRK 4001, GRK 4002, LATN 3001, LATN 3002, LATN 4001, LATN 4002, SPAN 4555, SPAN 4556, SPAN 4557, SPAN 4558, SPAN 4560, SPAN 4561, SPAN 4562 and SPAN 4563.

Disposition: Chancellor

12-75 Recommendation establishing [Domestic and Global Diversity Course Requirements](#).

Disposition: Chancellor

12-76 Revisions to *ECU Faculty Manual*, Appendix C. Section III. [Evaluation in reference to the Student Perception of Teaching Survey](#).

Disposition: Chancellor

12-77 Support of a Letter to the Chancellor Requesting Continued Involvement of the Committee and Library Administration in all phases of design, planning and decision-making of future space needs.

Disposition: University Libraries Committee

12-78 Endorsement of Professor David Dosser as the continued [Faculty Athletics Representative](#).

Disposition: Chancellor